



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

by ἡδη. In Thucyd. iii. 49 we have παρὰ τοσούτων κινδύνου, which is virtually the same construction without the article. The particular construction here employed seems to be unique—at least I find no similar one by a tolerably careful examination of the *Anabasis*. If the passage is really Xenophon's own, I believe the above explanation will suffice. On the other hand, as the speech is a short one and was made on a specially important occasion, the historian may have remembered it literally, in which case it is not wise to apply the rules of rhetoric too rigidly. If the second person were not implied in the verb, we should probably have it expressed with the infinitive. As the sentence stands, it is not ambiguous. To explain the three genitives as a case of the absolute construction seems to detract from the compactness of the sentence.

CHARLES W. SUPER

ATHENS, OHIO

THE MEANING OF δέξεται, AESCHYLUS *PROMETHEUS* 860

In only one of my new interpretations of the *Prometheus* does Mr. Bonner decide in favor of Wecklein.¹ The purpose of this paper is to show that the position of the German scholar here too (v. 860) can not be successfully defended. Mr. Bonner speaks of my "curt dismissal" of Wecklein's note as "not convincing." In the narrow compass of a note, in an edition in which the plan of annotation demanded that brevity be constantly studied, it was impossible to publish the reasons in full for my interpretation.

Mr. Bonner admits that the passages cited by Wecklein are "not exactly analogous." The only defense of the traditional interpretation offered is: "in view of vss. 856-59 it seems much more natural to supply αὐτοῖς with Wecklein, whose defense of the peculiar construction seems sufficient." But the difficulty does not lie in the construction—δαμέντων for δαμέντας is easy—an example of a common phenomenon in Aeschylus to which I had already called attention.

In the first place, the very fact that Wecklein proposes δ'αἰμάζεται shows (1) that he is not satisfied himself with δέξεται (which is found in all the manuscripts), and (2) that he can not get away from the idea that the verb has to do with the pursuers rather than the pursued. The same may be said of Pauw, who changes δέξεται to δέρεται and δαμέντων to δαμέντας. Hartung does even greater violence to the text and changes δέξεται to κλάγεται.

¹In his review of my edition in the March number of this *Journal*.

In the second place, the very verses cited by Mr. Bonner to support his contention force me to the conclusion that *αὐτὰς* is the object the poet had in mind. It is the sluggish northern mind that feels an unnaturalness in the sudden shift. The mobile Greek experienced no difficulty. The change to him was as easy as his wonted rapid change of tense. We must go even farther back than 856 to get the whole truth: *πάλιν πρὸς Ἄργος οὐχ ἑκοῦσ' ἐλεύσεται φεύγουσα θηρεύοντες*—and then suddenly *Πελασγία δὲ δέξεται*. Whom? Certainly not the cousins, the *κίρκοι* swooping fleetly after the trembling doves. *They* need no refuge. Furthermore, we know nothing of their condition as yet that would justify our inferring that *δέξεται* is not used in the ordinary sense of affording shelter, even if we grant that *Πελασγία* here signifies *γῆ* ("earth," "sod"), instead of "country." And it is the *γέννα πεντηκοντάπαις* we are interested in, not the *ἀνεψιοί*. In the whole story it is the fortunes of the descendants of Io that are uppermost in the narrator's mind, and we interrupt the course of that story by injecting such a notion as *δέξεται αὐτούς*. Whether Pelasgic earth will cover them or not does not concern us. We want to know the fate of those hunted maidens that have come back to their ancestral home—*τίνα χώρον ἐλεύσομαι; τίς δόμος δέξεται;* (Nonnus xxxi. 231).

When Dionysus and his train come to this same Argos, one of the god's retainers is told by a *Πελασγίδος ἄστος* to go back to Thebes (= *Πελασγία* *σε οὐ δέξεται*): *Ἰναχον . . . ἀναίneo· καί σε δεχέσθω | Θῆβης . . . ποταμός* (Nonnus xlvii. 496 f.). The Danaids were trying to escape from the violent and licentious Egyptians; Pelasgia saved them; but this could only be after they had rid themselves of their lords (tersely expressed by the aorist passive participle); hence the poet explains immediately (the narrative demanded conciseness): *θηλυκτόνῃ Ἄρει δαμέντων*. A just proportion precluded the expansion of this story. Otherwise Aeschylus would not have left us in doubt as to what he had in mind. But he was forced to severe compression, and with a stroke of the pen he gives us the incidental circumstance of the fate of the pursuers from whose clutches the maidens were trying to escape—these descendants of swarthy Touchborn, to whom we are assured Pelasgia will give a hearty welcome. Compare the experience of another fugitive, and note the verbs: *ὅς σε δίωκε . . . ἡμετέρη δεχέσθω . . . οὐ Θέτις Ἰνδῷ σε δεδέξεται, οὐδέ σε κόλπῃ | ξινοδόκον μετὰ κύμα πάλιν φεύγοντα σαώσει* (Nonnus xxvii. 41 ff.). Cf. also x. 90 ff. (*εἰς τίνα φεύγεις; ποῖον ὅρος δέχεται σε πεφυγμένον*), and xiii. 23. The Danaids came back to Argos (854), and Pelasgia received them hospitably; they dwelt in Argos in peace: *εἰς δόμος ἔστω . . . ἴξομαι εἰς ἐμὸν Ἄργος . . . ναιετάουσα . . . δεχέσθω* (xxxii. 255), *Μαιονίη πολυύλβος ἐὼν ναέτην με,*

δεχέσθω (xxxiii. 254), Βριτόμαρτις . . . ἦν ἐδίωκε . . . δέξο, δέξο, θάλασσα, φιλοξείνῃ σέο κόλπῳ . . . δέξο Βριτόμαρτιν ἀναινομένην ὑμεναίους | ὄφρα φύγω . . . Μορρῆα καὶ ὑμετέρην Ἀφροδίτην (xxxiii. 333 f.)—precisely the plight of the Danaids. Cypris passed Paphos and Byblos, and was first received in the οἶκος Ἑρώτων by Beroe: πρώτη Κύπριν ἔδεκτο φιλοξείνῃ πολεῶνι (xli. 97). The Egyptian maidens left the banks of the Nile and came to the hospitable shores of Greece to dwell in μεγάλη Πελασγία καὶ κατ' Ἄργος (Eur. *Suppl.* 367 f.)—λιπὼν Λιβάνοιο λόφον . . . Ἱξεαι εἰς Φρυγίην εὐπάρθενον . . . Ὀρήκη νυμφοκόμος σε δεδέξεται (xliii. 429 ff.). The lascivious lords were in hot pursuit ἐπτοημένοι φρένας, and each maiden chased (or chaste) in wild despair exclaimed: εἰς τίνα φεύγω . . . τίς πόλις ὁθνεῖ με δεδέξεται (xli. 260 ff.). When Oedipus says ὦ Κιθαιρών, τί μ' ἐδέχου; (*O. T.* 1390), he is not thinking of οὐμὸς Κιθαιρῶν οὗτος, ὃν . . . ἐθέσθην ζῶντι κύριον τάφον (1452 f.). The idea of receiving into one's home is inseparably connected with δέχεσθαι in all periods of the literature. Cf. Nonnus iv. 143 δέχνυσο δειλαίην με συνέστιον, iii. 115; Philostratus *Vita Apollon.* 49; *Vita Sophist.* 212, εἴ τις τὸν Ἀθηναῖον φεύγοντα δέξοιτο; 227, ὡς ἀνοῖξαι πείσαι τὰς οἰκίας καὶ δέξασθαι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους; *Epist.* 346, τοὺς ὄρνις αἱ καλῖαι δέχονται . . . πλανᾶται μεθιστάμενα καὶ μετοικοῦντα . . . οὕτω κἀγὼ σε ὑπεδεξάμην; 357, ἐδέξαντο καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι Διμήτραν φεύγουσαν. In the description of a picture in Philostratus (*Imag.* 389) the fugitives are sailing to Asia: ἀπὸ τῆς Εὐρώπης εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν . . . δέχεται δὲ αὐτοὺς οἰκία μάλα ἡδέα. Cf. Hesych. Miles. 29, Εὐκλείδης . . . Πλάτωνα καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς φιλοσόφους ἐδέξαντο, δείσαντας τὴν ὁμότητα τῶν τυράννων; Dion. Hal. *Antiq. Rom.* i. 12, Λιγυστική τε γῆ σε δέξεται (from Sophocles); Moschus i. 158, Κρήτη δέ σε δέξεται; Lycophron 1021, Κράθις . . . συνοίκους δέξεται.

I have confined myself to citations from later Greek writers because a reference to some index will furnish examples from the early literature. Cf., however, Soph. *El.* 160 ff., ὃν ἂ κλεινὰ | γὰ ποτε Μυκηναίων | δέξεται (Orestes); Aesch. *Suppl.* 219; Ar. *Av.* 1708; Eur. *Alc.* 855.

That δέχεσθαι is often used in the sense scholars would assign the word here is well known, but mostly in conjunction with τάφος (or γῆ, νῆσος, ὄρος), and almost always with θανόντα or an equivalent. Cf. Eur. *I. T.* 625. Diodorus Siculus quotes the verse (xx. 14. 6) and supplies the information: ἦν δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀνδριάς Κρόνου χαλκοῦς, ἐκτετακὼς τὰς χεῖρας ὑπτίας ἐγκεκλιμένας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ὥστε τὸν ἐπιτεθέντα τῶν παίδων ἀποκυλίσσθαι καὶ πίπτειν εἰς τι χάσμα πλήρες πυρός (hence the appropriateness of δέχεσθαι). Cf. Lycophron 805 f., Πέργη δέ μιν θανόντα Τυρσηνῶν ὄρος | ἐν Γορτυναίᾳ δέξεται πεφλεγμένον. But the important fact for us to observe is that in the vast

majority of cases an entirely different verb is used; e. g., Aristotle, *Frag. Hist.* 640, 8. Τεύκρον ἀποφθίμενον γῇ Σαλαμῖς κατέχει; 9. 10, Νέσωρα . . . ἦδε θανόντα | γῇ κατέχει; 17, ἔχε γαῖα; 22, κρύπτει; 45, κεύθει.

J. E. HARRY

CINCINNATI, April 4, 1906

REJOINDER

My judgment upon Mr. Harry's interpretation of *Prom.* 860 was little more than "not proved;" and I am the less disposed to defend Wecklein's view at length because the ground now taken by Mr. Harry is not the same as that taken in his edition. His express rejection of Wecklein's examples (*Soph. Tr.* 803, *Eur. Hel.* 58) certainly led me to think that he found a difficulty in the construction of *δαμέντων*, especially since he did not then raise the question of the usage of *δέξεται*; now he bases his interpretation largely on that word. Some readers will doubtless be convinced by his argument. Others may be obstinate enough to think, with me, that Wecklein's position is not yet proved untenable. I can not accept the assertion that "the idea of receiving into one's home is inseparably connected with *δέχεσθαι* in all periods of the literature," in view of the well-known use in the sense of "meet the attack" of an enemy, which is as old as Homer and is frequent in Xenophon. But, granting due weight to Mr. Harry's examples, the familiar conception of the last resting-place as "the long home," the house of Hades *πολυδέκτης* (cf. *Prom.* 153 and Mr. Harry's note), would make Wecklein's interpretation of the verb at least defensible.

To touch upon another objection, is not "*θανόντα* or an equivalent" at least indicated in *δαμέντων*? If so, by Mr. Harry's own showing, the "traditional" interpretation of *δέξεται* is possible here. The only other important question, I believe, is: Who are more naturally understood as the object of *δέξεται*? Upon this point I have no wish to dogmatize, and, as there is no space for a full discussion, I merely submit that Wecklein's view is not finally disposed of by Mr. Harry's arguments.

CAMPBELL BONNER

NASHVILLE TENN.

[This emphasis on the idea of shelter in *δέξεται* lends a fine meaning to *δέξεται* [*αὐτοῖς*]: "Pelagia shall receive them (the pursuers) into its shelter with woman-deed of murder, in that they are laid low in death by night-waking boldness."—A. F.]